

In the Drawings

The Applicant encloses new amended drawing sheet containing Figure 7. The Applicant respectfully advises that this drawing sheet was submitted with preliminary amendment filed on July 14, 2005, replacing drawing sheets 1-36.

We trust the examiner did receive this preliminary amendment.

Remarks/Arguments

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Official Action dated November 2, 2005. In response to the issues raised, we offer the following submissions and amendments.

Amendment

The amendment to the cross reference table is merely to update US serial numbers to patent numbers and correct typographical errors.

The amendment to page 9 addresses the typographical error identified by the Examiner.

The enclosed replacement drawing sheet has corrected the typographical error in the drawing reference numbering on Figure 7.

Accordingly, we submit that the amendments do not add any new matter.

Claims – 35USC§102

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 7 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,199,977 to Komplin et al.

Applicant submits that the cited reference fails to teach the combination of elements defined by Claim 1. The printing fluid dispensing system defined by claim 1 requires the outlet for each fluid dispenser to be at a different location relative to the location feature depending on the type of printing fluid within the dispenser. The Examiner has equated the keying member 50 on each ink cartridge 12 described in '977 with the feature defined in claim 1 for locating the dispenser on the printer. The ink cartridges 12 each have ink outlets 30 at a fixed location relative to the keying feature 50. There is no teaching or suggestion of the outlets being located at a number of predetermined positions relative to the locating feature depending on the type of ink.

Accordingly, '977 fails to anticipate claim 1 or dependent claims 2 to 6.

Likewise, Claim 7 defines printing fluid dispenser system where each one of the fluid dispensers can connect to a refill port with a number of inlets. The dispenser outlet connects to one of the inlets depending on the color of ink it contains. This system inherently requires

the outlet on each dispenser of a different color, to be at a different position. In contrast, '977 shows each cartridge engaging an inlet port with a single inlet. The keying features 50 ensure that each cartridge mates with the correspondingly colored inlet port. There is no disclosure of a system that allows differently colored ink dispensers from engaging a single refill port, where the position of the outlet determines which of the inlets on the printer establishes a fluid connection.

It follows that Claim 7 is novel in light of the '977 reference.

Claims – 35USC§103

Claim 3 stands rejected as obvious in light of '977 in view of US 6,250,738 to Waller.

As discussed above, '977 fails to disclose a system that allows differently colored ink dispensers from engaging a single refill port, where the position of the outlet determines which of the inlets on the printer establishes a fluid connection. Waller also fails to teach this claim element. As the combined disclosures of the cited references do not teach all the elements of the claimed combination, they do not support a §103 rejection. Accordingly, claim 3 is not obvious in view of the respective citations.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762